

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office. Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/974,739	10/09/2001	Raymundo Saenz	DP-306444	7051	
7:	590 11/13/2002				
MARGARET A. DOBROWITSKY			EXAMINER		
DELPHI TECHNOLOGIES, INC. Legal Staff P.O. Box 5052, Mail Code: 480-414-420 Troy, MI 48007-5052			BUTLER, DO	BUTLER, DOUGLAS C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,,			3683		

DATE MAILED: 11/13/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF C MMERCE Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR SERIAL NUMBER FILING DATE

	EXAMINER	
	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		5 11-13-43
	DATE MAILED:	
This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application. COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS		
	•	
This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on		This action is made final.
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire month(s), _ Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandon		m the date of this letter.
Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:		
		ent Drawing Review, PTO-948. Application, PTO-152.
Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION		
1. Claims		are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims	are	withdrawn from consideration.
2. Claims		have been cancelled.
3. Claims		_ are allowed.
4. (1) Claims Y		_ are rejected.
5. Claims		_ are objected to.
6. Ctaimsar	e subject to restriction	n or election requirement.
7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are	acceptable for exami	ination purposes.
8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.		
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on	Under 37 C t Drawing Review, P	F.R. 1.84 these drawings TO-948).
10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed onexaminer; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).	, has (have) been	☐ approved by the
11. The proposed drawing correction, filed, has been approx	red; 🛘 disapproved	(see explanation).
12. Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified been filed in parent application, serial no; filed on		eceived not been received
13. Since this application apppears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matter accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.	ers, prosecution as to	the merits is closed in
14. Other		

Application/Control Number: 09/974,739

Art Unit: 3683

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

- 1. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 2. The prior art submitted by applicant has been considered and made of record by way of applicant-submitted Form PTO-1449 (copy enclosed for applicant's files).
- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over instant Figures 1-3, admitted prior art, in view of Hayakawa et al(US005556175) or Wieczorek et al(5704553).

Instant Figures 1-3, admitted prior art, discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for the specific configuration and mounting for the ball valve thereof.

.

Art Unit: 3683

Each of the secondary references to Hayakawa et al(US005556175) and Wieczorek et al(5704553) teaches the feature of configuring the ball valve to have a reduced footprint mounting section for connection to a stem or rod. See Fig. 11 of Hayakawa et al(US005556175) and Figure 2 of Wieczorek et al(5704553).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one having ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains to modify the ball valve arrangement of instant Figures 1-3, admitted prior art, to be partially spherical with a reduced footprint mounting section for connection to a rod or stem as taught by each of the secondary references to Hayakawa et al(US005556175) and Wieczorek et al(5704553) since such modification involves replacing one well known type of ball valve and manner of connection of the ball valve to its associated rod with an equivalent type of ball valve and manner of connection of the ball valve to its associated rod. The assemblies operate in substantially the same manner with substantially the same effect.

Re the specific shape of the ball valves, re the variety of embodiments set forth in instant Figures 5-10 as being claimed, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one having ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains to modify the shape of the ball valve as desired since such modifications would have involved changes within the ability of an artisan in the art in order to adapt the ball valve to a particular environment and utility. A change in shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. See MPEP 2144.04 under the heading "Legal Precedent as Source of Supporting Rationale" re various changes in shape. In re Dailey, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966).

Application/Control Number: 09/974,739

Art Unit: 3683

The method of claims 8-14 is encompassed by the above modified structure.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Exmr. Butler whose telephone number is (703) 308-2575. The examiner is

normally in the USPTO Monday-Friday from 5:30 a.m. to 2:00p.m. Although the examiner may

not always be present in his office to immediately answer the phone when called, the examiner

will make every effort to return the call as soon as possible. If the examiner does not answer his

phone, the examiner suggests that a brief message be recorded on the examiner's voice mail

machine when necessary and appropriate. The examiner normally checks recorded phone calls at

least once a day unless on leave.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is (703) 305-7687. Examiner Butler's immediate supervisor is Jack Lavinder at

(703)308-3421.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

DOUGLAS C. BUTLER
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 4